



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.   |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 10/052,268  | 01/23/2002  | Naofumi Kobayashi    | 826.1469D           | 2918               |
| 21171   | 7590        | 04/17/2006           | EXAMINER            |                    |
| STAAS & HALSEY LLP<br>SUITE 700<br>1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20005 |             |                      |                     | LEE, CHI HO ANDREW |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER       |
|   |             |                      | 2616                |                    |

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                               |                         |  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b>        | <b>Applicant(s)</b>     |  |
|                              | 10/052,268                    | KOBAYASHI, NAOFUMI      |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Andrew Lee | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2616 |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

ANDREW C. LEE  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

#### Attachment(s)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/23/02, 6/9/05, 3/16/05, 6/23/05</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Double Patenting***

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1, 23, 25, of U.S. Patent No. 6,359,873. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1, 23, 25 of U.S. Patent Number 6,359,873 encompasses the limitations of claims 1-8 of instant application. Moreover, omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. It is well settled that the omission of an element and its functions is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements performs the same function as before *In re Karlson*, 163 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963). Also note *Ex parte Rainu*, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd. App. 1969).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foster, Jr. et al U.S. Patent Number 6,016,313 in view of Shigihara et al U.S. Patent Number 5,966,186.

Re Claims 1-8, Foster teaches in Fig. 1 a wireless LAN system comprising a 101 (a wireless LAN master station) for supporting communication between 151 and 152 (one or more wireless LAN satellite stations) wherein 151 (See fig. 5, steps 503 & 507) transmits a control signal (control frame) through a antenna element (control frame transmitting means) and determining receive signal strength at antenna element N (antenna directivity characteristic controlling means) (See col. 20, lines 1-23).

Foster fails to explicitly teach “an antenna for dynamically changing a directivity characteristic” to a “maximum”.

However, Shigihara et al teaches in fig. 14, a antenna bearing adjustment process (adjusting means...for adjusting antenna directivity) whereby the antenna directivity is readjusted to produce peak input antenna level (See col. 13, lines 1-18). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to modify Foster to include the antenna bearing adjustment process of Shigihara et al to select the most reliable data

transmission channel. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled combine the teachings

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-3130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on 571-272-3134. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AI  
4/12/06

ANDREW C. LEE  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

